REMARKS

The Office Action mailed November 15, 2006 has been carefully considered by applicant. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the remarks that follow.

Published Application

Applicant reviewed the published application and notes that the Patent Office incorrectly transcribed the word "rescaling" as "resealing" throughout the specification. The Examiner is referred, for example, to paragraphs [0043], [0046], [0047], and [0048]. Applicant requests that the Patent Office correct these mistakes so that they do not appear in any patent ultimately issued from the present application.

Response to Election/Restriction

Herein applicant has cancelled claims 7-24 as being previously withdrawn claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 39 has been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By the present amendment, claim 39 is rewritten as new independent claim 42. Claim 42 is believed allowable in accordance with the indication in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-6, 25-33, 35-37 and 40-41 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0039084. Claim 34 has been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi and further in view of Butler et al U.S. Patent No. 6,573,913. Claim 38 has been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art in the specification, paragraph [0054].

Claims 1-6 are cancelled. Thus rendering the rejections thereof moot.

Claim 25 has been amended and states that the software program comprises a data scaling portion that dynamically scales a moved graphical element such that when the graphical element is moved, the graphical element appears unchanged. This aspect is neither taught nor suggested by any of the art cited in the Office Action. As such, claim 25 is neither anticipated, nor rendered obvious by the prior art.

One embodiment of the claimed invention is described in paragraph [0044] - [0048]. When a graphical element is moved from a first display having a first resolution to a second display having a second resolution that is different than the first resolution, the graphical element is dynamically scaled optimally for the monitor on which it is to be displayed. This happens consistently during the application execution, every time a component is created at a particular point on the screen, and every time a component is shifted to another location on a monitor with a different resolution. This significantly enhances the usability of the application on mixed monitor systems, making every component in font appear uniform across the application. In this manner, a system may be set to operate such that the user does not perceive a difference in screen resolutions with regard to elements transferred from one display screen to a different display screen.

Yamaguchi does not teach or suggest a software program for moving a graphical element from a first display with a first resolution to a second display with a second resolution that is different from the first resolution. It follows that Yamaguchi also fails to teach or suggest the claimed data scaling portion that dynamically scales a moved graphical element such that the graphical element appears unchanged. The Examiner states that Yamaguchi teaches "exchanging images that are to be displayed on respective displays". It is true that paragraph 45 of Yamaguchi teaches a controller that is arranged to display images on a plurality of image screens and exchange images (i.e. remove an image and replace it with a different image). However Yamaguchi does not teach the recited "moving" of a graphical element from a first display to a second display. As specifically defined in the present application, "moving" refers to moving in real time; not

storing and then later (i.e. several minutes later) opening the data on a different workstation. See paragraph [0022].

The Examiner states that Yamaguchi does not explicitly teach whether "exchanging images on the respective displays" denotes exchanging images among displays, however, it is well known in the art for doctors to see more than one image in detail to enable accurate diagnosis by exchanging a medical image from a low resolution display to a higher resolution display, when the plurality of displays are simultaneously displaying medical images. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that it is known for doctors to exchange medical images from a low resolution display to a higher resolution display. This much is discussed in the Background of the Invention section of the present application (see paragraphs [0002] - [0005]). However, a severe drawback of known systems and software programs is that on screen components and fonts that are scaled correctly for the high resolution monitors will look huge and blown up on the low resolution monitors. Therefore, there is a large need in the art for a system that automatically adjusts the image size so that it is appropriate for the monitor on which it is displayed. Yamaguchi fails to teach or suggest such a system and does not meet the identified need.

The shortcomings of Yamaguchi are not overcome by Butler et al, which also fails to teach or suggest the claimed system and does not meet the identified needs.

Only according to the present invention is there provided a software program that has a data scaling portion that dynamically scales a moved graphical element such that when the graphical element is moved, the visual appearance of the graphical element remains unchanged. Yamaguchi fails to teach or suggest such a program and such a program is neither taught or suggested by Butler et al, or by the remaining art. As such, claim 25 is believed allowable over the cited references.

Claims 26-34 are allowable for the reasons stated above, as well as for the detailed subject matter cited therein.

Claim 35 recites a workstation and is amended to state that the processing circuit of the workstation is configured to rescale graphical elements moved between high resolution display and low resolution display such that the graphical element appears unchanged. For the reasons stated above, Yamaguchi fails to teach or suggest such a processing circuit. At most, the Yamaguchi system is adapted to "exchange" images. However, there is no processing circuit that rescales graphical elements moved between the high resolution display and the low resolution display. There is also no processing circuit that is adapted to move the graphical element such that the graphical element appears unchanged. Butler et al does not overcome the deficiencies of Yamaguchi. Claim 35 is thus believed allowable.

Claims 36-41 depend directly or indirectly from claim 35 and are thus believed allowance for the reasons stated above, as well as the subject matter cited therein.

Conclusion

The present application is thus believed in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

By: _____

Peter T. Holsen
Reg. No. 54,180

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, St. 1100
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 271-7590